

The large-parts formula for $p(n)$

Jerome Kelleher *

February 7, 2010

Abstract

A new formula for the partition function $p(n)$ is developed. We show that the number of partitions of n can be expressed as the sum of a simple function of the two largest parts of all partitions. Specifically, if $a_1 + \dots + a_k = n$ is a partition of n with $a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_k$ and $a_0 = 0$, then the sum of $\lfloor (a_k + a_{k-1}) / (a_{k-1} + 1) \rfloor$ over all partitions of n is equal to $2p(n) - 1$.

1 Introduction

A sequence of positive integers $a_1 \dots a_k$ is an ascending composition of the positive integer n if $a_1 + \dots + a_k = n$ and $a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_k$. Let $\mathcal{A}(n)$ be the set of all ascending compositions of n for some $n \geq 1$, and let $\mathcal{A}(n, m) \subseteq \mathcal{A}(n)$ be defined for $1 \leq m \leq n$ as $\mathcal{A}(n, m) = \{a_1 \dots a_k \mid a_1 \dots a_k \in \mathcal{A}(n) \text{ and } a_1 \geq m\}$. Also, let $A(n) = |\mathcal{A}(n)|$, $A(n, m) = |\mathcal{A}(n, m)|$ and define $a_0 = 0$ for all ascending compositions. We show that

$$2p(n) - 1 = \sum_{a_1 \dots a_k \in \mathcal{A}(n)} \left\lfloor \frac{a_{k-1} + a_k}{a_{k-1} + 1} \right\rfloor \quad (1)$$

for all $n \geq 1$ using a simple combinatorial argument.

The proof of (1) proceeds as follows. In Section 2 we demonstrate that the suffix length of $\mathcal{A}(n)$ with respect to the lexicographic ordering is $2p(n) - 1$. Then, in Section 3, we derive the lexicographic succession rule for ascending compositions, and show that iteratively applying this rule to all elements of $\mathcal{A}(n)$ also allows us to compute the suffix length. The main result then follows immediately from these observations.

*Institute of Evolutionary Biology, University of Edinburgh, King's Buildings, West Mains Road, EH9 3JT U.K. jerome.kelleher@ed.ac.uk

1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	2	
1	1	3		
1	2	2		
1	4			
2	3			
5				

Figure 1: Adjacency boxes of the set $\mathcal{A}(5)$ in lexicographic order. Theorem 2.1 shows that there are $2p(n) - 1$ of these boxes for all n . In this example, we have $p(5) = 7$ and a total of 13 boxes.

2 Suffix Length

If we consider the set of ascending compositions in lexicographic order, then the suffix length is defined as the sum of the length of all suffixes that differ between adjacent compositions. The suffix length is a key element of Kemp's general approach to the analysis of combinatorial generation algorithms [2]. In this section we show that the suffix length of $\mathcal{A}(n)$ with respect to the lexicographic ordering is $2p(n) - 1$. To prove this result, we require a recurrence to enumerate the ascending compositions.

To count the ascending compositions of n where the first part is at least m , we first observe that there is exactly one composition where $a_1 > \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. We then note that $m \leq a_1 \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ when there is more than one part, since all values between m and $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ are legitimate smallest parts. We then get

$$A(n, m) = 1 + \sum_{x=m}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} A(n-x, x) \quad (2)$$

for all positive integers $m \leq n$ [1, ch.3].

Let $L(n, m)$ be the suffix length of the set $\mathcal{A}(n, m)$ with respect to the lexicographic ordering. This corresponds to the number of adjacency boxes in $\mathcal{A}(n, m)$ as shown in Figure 1. In this diagram we list ascending compositions in lexicographic order, and draw a box around parts in adjacent partitions that are equal. Since parts in adjacent compositions are equal, we need one 'write' operation for that part when generating the set. We count these boxes by first noting that there is exactly one box in the set $\mathcal{A}(n, m)$ when $m > \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. Then, for each possible value for the smallest part x , there is one box, plus the boxes in $\mathcal{A}(n-x, x)$. We therefore get the following recurrence

$$L(n, m) = 1 + \sum_{x=m}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} (L(n-x, x) + 1), \quad (3)$$

which holds for all $1 \leq m \leq n$.

Theorem 2.1. *If $n \geq 1$, then $L(n, m) = 2A(n, m) - 1$ for all $1 \leq m \leq n$.*

Proof. Proceed by strong induction on n . For $n = 1$, we immediately have $L(1, 1) = 2A(1, 1) - 1$ from (2) and (3).

Suppose, then, that $L(n', m) = 2A(n', m) - 1$ when $1 \leq m \leq n'$, for all $1 < n' < n$, and some integer n . Since $n' - x < n'$ for all $1 \leq m \leq x \leq \lfloor n'/2 \rfloor < n'$, we get

$$L(n', m) = 1 + 2 \sum_{x=m}^{\lfloor n'/2 \rfloor} A(n' - x, x)$$

by (3) and the inductive hypothesis. Rearranging, we get

$$L(n', m) = 2 \left(1 + \sum_{x=m}^{\lfloor n'/2 \rfloor} A(n' - x, x) \right) - 1.$$

Substituting for (2) we get $L(n', m) = 2A(n', m) - 1$, as required. $\square$

3 Lexicographic Successor

Let $M_{\mathcal{A}}(n, m)$ be the lexicographically least element of the set $\mathcal{A}(n, m)$, and define $\langle n \rangle$ to be the singleton composition $a_1 = n$. It is easy to see that

$$M_{\mathcal{A}}(n, m) = \overbrace{m \dots m}^{\mu} \langle n - \mu m \rangle, \quad (4)$$

where $\mu = \lfloor n/m \rfloor - 1$, since the prefix of $M_{\mathcal{A}}(n, m)$ must be a sequence of m of maximum length. Then, if we let $S_{\mathcal{A}}(a_1 \dots a_k)$ be the lexicographic successor of $a_1 \dots a_k$ for any $a_1 \dots a_k \in \mathcal{A}(n) \setminus \{\langle n \rangle\}$, we have

$$S_{\mathcal{A}}(a_1 \dots a_k) = a_1 \dots a_{k-2} \overbrace{m \dots m}^{\mu} \langle n' - \mu m \rangle \quad (5)$$

where $m = a_{k-1} + 1$, $n' = a_{k-1} + a_k$, and $\mu = \lfloor n'/m \rfloor - 1$. We can see that (5) correctly generates the lexicographic successor of $a_1 \dots a_k$ because it appends the lexicographically least element of the set $\mathcal{A}(a_{k-1} + a_k, a_{k-1} + 1)$ to $a_1 \dots a_{k-2}$ (see Kelleher [1, ch.5] for a full proof).

Theorem 3.1. *For all $n \geq 1$*

$$2A(n, m) - 1 = \left\lfloor \frac{n(1-m)}{m} \right\rfloor + \sum_{\substack{a_1 \dots a_k \in \\ \mathcal{A}(n)}} \left\lfloor \frac{a_{k-1} + a_k}{a_{k-1} + 1} \right\rfloor \quad (6)$$

Proof. The number of write operations required to generate the lexicographically least element of $\mathcal{A}(n, m)$ is $\lfloor n/m \rfloor$ by (4), since there are $\lfloor n/m \rfloor - 1$ copies

of m written, followed by one write to insert the remainder at the end of the composition. The remaining write operations are then counted by summing the number of writes required by (5) over all elements of $\mathcal{A}(n) \setminus \{\langle n \rangle\}$. The number of writes required to transition from an arbitrary composition $a_1 \dots a_k$ to its lexicographic successor is $\lfloor (a_k + a_{k-1}) / (a_{k-1} + 1) \rfloor$ by (5). Therefore, we get

$$L(n, m) = \lfloor n/m \rfloor + \sum_{\substack{a_1 \dots a_k \in \\ \mathcal{A}(n) \setminus \{\langle n \rangle\}}} \left\lfloor \frac{a_{k-1} + a_k}{a_{k-1} + 1} \right\rfloor$$

Then, since $\lfloor (a_{k-1} + a_k) / (a_{k-1} + 1) \rfloor = n$ when $a_1 = n$ (and $a_0 = 0$), we get

$$L(n, m) = n - \lfloor n/m \rfloor + \sum_{\substack{a_1 \dots a_k \in \\ \mathcal{A}(n)}} \left\lfloor \frac{a_{k-1} + a_k}{a_{k-1} + 1} \right\rfloor$$

Substituting for $L(n, m) = 2A(n, m) - 1$ using Theorem 2.1 we get (6), as required. $\square$

Setting $m = 1$ in (6) we get (1), and therefore establish the main result.

References

- [1] Jerome Kelleher. *Encoding Partitions as Ascending Compositions*. PhD thesis, University College Cork, 2006.
- [2] Rainer Kemp. Generating words lexicographically: An average-case analysis. *Acta Informatica*, 35(1):17–89, January 1998.